

VZCZCXYZ0008
OO RUEHWEB

DE RUEHGV #0241/01 0591735
ZNY SSSSS ZZH
O R 281735Z FEB 10
FM USMISSION GENEVA
TO RHEHAAA/NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE
RHMFISS/CJCS WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE
RHMFISS/CNO WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE
RHMFISS/DEPT OF ENERGY WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE
RHMFISS/DTRA ALEX WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE
RHMFISS/JOINT STAFF WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE
RUEAIIA/CIA WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE
RUEHC/SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 0665
RUEHNO/USMISSION USNATO IMMEDIATE 0413
RUEKJCS/SECDEF WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE
INFO RUEHGV/USMISSION GENEVA
RUEHKV/AMEMBASSY KYIV 0483
RUEHMO/AMEMBASSY MOSCOW 0487
RUEHTA/AMEMBASSY ASTANA 0483

S E C R E T GENEVA 000241

SIPDIS
DEPT FOR T, VCI AND EUR/PRA
DOE FOR NNSA/NA-24
CIA FOR WINPAC
JSCS FOR J5/DDGSA
SECDEF FOR OSD(P)/STRATCAP
NAVY FOR CNO-N5JA AND DIRSSP
AIRFORCE FOR HQ USAF/ASX AND ASXP
DTRA FOR OP-OS OP-OSA AND DIRECTOR
NSC FOR LOOK
DIA FOR LEA

E.O. 12958: DECL: 2020/02/28
TAGS: [PARM](#) [KACT](#) [MARR](#) [PREL](#) [RS](#) [US](#)
SUBJECT: SFO-GVA-VIII: (U) MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING WORKING GROUP
MEETING, FEBRUARY 23, 2010

CLASSIFIED BY: Rose E. Gottemoeller, Assistant Secretary, Department
of State, VCI; REASON: 1.4(B), (D)

[1](#)1. (U) This is SFO-GVA-VIII-077.

[1](#)2. (U) Meeting Date: February 23, 2010

Time: 3:30 P.M. - 6:00 P.M.

Place: Russian Mission, Geneva

SUMMARY

[1](#)3. (S) During a meeting of the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) Working Group (WG), the U.S. and Russian chairs began working through a joint draft text (JDT) of Part Four of the Annex on Inspection Activities (Site Diagrams). A lengthy discussion ensued over the difference between the title of Part Two of the Protocol, Database for Strategic Offensive Arms, and the actual "database" that will be created 45 days after signature. Additionally, some changes were made to Part Two of the Protocol based on the recent agreement on the terms for non-deployed launcher of ICBMs and SLBMs and non-deployed heavy bombers. End summary.

[1](#)4. (S) SUBJECT SUMMARY: Discussion of Part Two; Article VI; and

DISCUSSION OF PART TWO

15. (S) Mr. Trout said he had a few quick items in Part Two that he wished to discuss prior to focusing on site diagrams. First, he presented Gen Orlov with some START photographs which showed the difference between various versions of mobile launchers of ICBMs. This spurred a conversation about "version" versus "variant." Orlov asked what was more important, the words or the actual data (measurements). Trout answered that naturally the data was more important, but it was also important to write the text correctly. No changes were made.

16. (S) Referring to Section V on heavy bombers, Trout said the United States would drop the brackets around "equipped for nuclear armaments" after the category non-deployed heavy bombers. This change was based on recent agreement on the definition of "non-deployed heavy bomber."

17. (S) In Section VI on space launch facilities, Trout announced that the United States would delete all U.S.-bracketed text and accept the Russian text to describe both ICBMs and SLBMs and ICBM and SLBM launchers at space launch facilities as "non-deployed."

ARTICLE VI

18. (S) Orlov asked to clarify a point which came up during a recent Heads of Delegation meeting in which Assistant Secretary Gottemoeller announced the United States was deleting Article VI which dealt specifically with mobile missiles. Orlov stated that if the United States was dropping Article VI, then the United States should drop all text that related to this Article from all places in the Protocol and Annex to include Part Two of the Protocol.

19. (S) Trout clarified that the U.S. decision to drop Article VI did not mean U.S. insistence on a boundary on road-mobile ICBM bases had been dropped. Trout continued that the boundary issue required more discussion. Additionally, the sides needed to agree where non-deployed ICBM launchers could be located on an ICBM base.

110. (S) Orlov pointed out that these issues would not be solved at the working group level, to which Trout agreed. Trout stated a personal idea that perhaps each Party should have boundaries for both silo and mobile ICBM bases. In that manner, the requirement would not apply uniquely to mobile forces. Orlov said he would think about that approach.

¶11. (S) Trout delivered the U.S.-proposed Joint Draft Text (JDT), Annex on Inspection Activities, Part Four - Site Diagrams, that reflected the Russian proposals of the prior week. He suggested that the working group work from this revision, to which Orlov agreed.

¶12. (S) LT Lobner delivered a few opening remarks, stating that the United States had generally accepted the Russian structure of the Annex and that this structure was reflected in the new JDT. Lobner called attention to a new U.S. proposal for a simplified site diagram for a submarine base, which was developed based on

discussion in the previous meeting and the Russian-bracketed text in the paragraph specifying the requirements for coastlines and waters diagrams. Finally, Lobner pointed out that this JDT incorporated some Russian-proposed text where it was easy to reconcile the text; however, other text required some clarification in order for the United States to understand the meaning behind the Russian proposal of last week.

¶13. (S) After some discussion, the title of Part Four was agreed as "Requirements for Site Diagrams of Facilities Subject to Inspection Activities."

¶14. (S) This was followed by a lengthy discussion over the phrase "facility listed in Part Two of the Protocol" in the opening paragraph. Trout pointed out that the phrase should be replaced with "Database for Strategic Offensive Arms" as there would never be any facilities listed in Part Two of the Protocol. Orlov, seemingly puzzled, responded that the title of Part Two of the Protocol is "the Database."

¶15. (S) Trout stated that although the title of Part Two of the Protocol was indeed "Database for Strategic Offensive Arms," in reality, Part Two was not a database. The database would not be created until 45 days after signature when it was populated with real numbers organized in the database by the categories of data listed in Part Two of the Protocol. After many exchanges between Orlov and Trout to explain this situation, Orlov stated the Russian side would have to think about an appropriate title for Part Two again, as the idea of having the same word "database" referring to two totally different concepts was very confusing.

¶16. (S) Returning to the text, Petrov asked the U.S. side to clarify the meaning of the phrase "depicting all facilities located within" in the context of the requirements for drawing simplified site diagrams. Lobner explained that the United States had taken the agreed definition of "facilities," which now had been expanded to include such things as the maintenance facility, basing areas, and silo launcher groups, to clarify what should be in a simplified site diagram. Petrov asked why the United States could not simply accept "a simplified site diagram of the entire ICBM base" with no further qualifications, as "ICBM base" was an agreed term and included such facilities as silo launcher groups and the maintenance facility. Lobner replied that the Russian-proposed language did not necessarily mean that a Party would be required to show all such facilities and could leave a loophole that a Party could simply show some facilities that were on the ICBM base. Lobner added, however, that perhaps "facilities" was indeed a broad term, and perhaps the text could be more specific about what should be included in the simplified site diagrams.

¶17. (S) After further discussion, Trout deleted the word "facilities" and replaced it with a list of the specific facilities that would be included in the simplified site diagram.

¶18. (S) Petrov pointed out that the U.S.-proposed JDT did not incorporate the Russian position in subparagraph 1(a)(iii) in that the word "inspection site" was not inserted as the Russian proposal instead of "maintenance facility" near the end of the sentence.

¶19. (S) Noting the change, Trout agreed to consider it, and on that last comment, concluded the meeting, agreeing to meet the next day to continue progress on the JDT.

¶20. (S) Documents provided:

- United States:

-- U.S.-proposed Joint Draft Text of Part Four of the Annex on Inspection Activities (Site Diagrams)

¶21. (U) Participants:

UNITED STATES

Mr. Trout

LTC Littorini

LT Lobner (RO)

Mr. French (Int)

RUSSIA

Gen. Orlov

COL Petrov

Mr. Pischulov

Ms. Evarovskaya (Int)

¶22. (U) Gottemoeller sends.
KING